

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

11 CURTIS and CHARLOTTE WESTLEY,
12 individually and on behalf of others similarly
13 situated,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 OCLARO, INC., et al.,

17 Defendants.

No. 11-cv-02448 EMC (NC)
and related consolidated action
(Lead Case No. 11-cv-03176 EMC
(NC))
(Derivative Action)

ORDER RE: DISCOVERY LETTER

Re: Dkt. Nos. 140, 142

18 IN RE OCLARO, INC. DERIVATIVE
19 LITIGATION,

Lead Case No. 11-cv-03176 EMC (NC)
(Related cases:
11-cv-03214 EMC (NC)
11-cv-03322 EMC (NC)
11-cv-03668 EMC (NC))
(Derivative Action)

21 This Document Relates to:

22 *Westley v. Oclaro, Inc., et al.,*
23 11-cv-02448-EMC (NC)
24
25
26
27
28

1 After considering plaintiffs' discovery letter seeking an order requiring defendants to
2 identify Rule 30(b)(6) deposition designees, Dkt. No. 140, and defendants' opposition, Dkt.
3 No. 142, the Court hereby denies plaintiffs' request. The Court notes that it expects counsel
4 to work out cooperatively such issues to avoid unnecessary court intervention.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Date: April 11, 2013

7 
Nathanael M. Cousins
United States Magistrate Judge